<u>Remarks</u>

Claims 1-41 are pending. Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-21 and 33-38 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Auxier et al., US 6,379,251 ("Auxier"). Claims 39, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Auxier in view of Official Notice. Claims 9 and 22-32 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Auxier in view of Landsman et al., US 6,785,659 ("Landsman"). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Auxier in view of Erlichman, US 6,790,138. Applicants have herein amended claims 1, 14, 22, 28 and 33 to better clarify the subject matter of the application. In addition, Applicants have herein amended claim 18 to address the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, issue raised by the Examiner. No new matter is believed added.

Applicants submit that the claims as presented are allowable over the cited art. For instance, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "an enhancement module for altering an output format of the content object, wherein the enhancement module *rearranges* image data of the content object, and wherein the enhancement module operates on content objects having an *unspecified visual format*. Auxier fails to teach these features. In particular, Auxier teaches providing an overlay that sits on top of the ad (i.e., content object) and allows for the implementation of a "scratch off" type game. Thus, as can be seen in Figures 4 and 7 of Auxier, the banner must be of a predetermined visual format in order to allow for the scratch-off overlay (i.e., the system must know something about the visual format of the banner ad in order to know where to put the "scratch off" regions). Conversely, since the present invention does not simply use overlays, but instead

manipulates the actual image data of the content object to enhance the ad, the invention

can operate on content objects having an *unspecified visual format*. Along the same

lines, Auxier fails to teach or suggest "rearranging" the image data of the content object.

For example, as shown in Applicants' Figures 7 and 8, the actual image data of the

content object is **rearranged** to create a puzzle, a break-out game, etc. Auxier does not

rearrange the data, but instead, places an overlay on the underlying content object to

create a "scratch off" game. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1, and the

claims that depend therefrom are allowable over the art of record. Claim 33, as well as

the claims that depend therefrom, is believed allowable for similar reasons.

In addition to the arguments present above, claim 14 is believed allowable since

Auxier fails to teach or suggest a plurality of smaller images that can be *relocated* by an

end user. Auxier again only teaches removing (i.e., scratching off) a portion of the ad.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that independent claims 22 and 28 are not

obvious in view of the cited art. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three

basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in

the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill

in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must

be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references

when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." MPEP 706.02(j).

The prior art fails to teach or suggest each of the claim limitations. For instance,

claim 22 (and similarly claim 28) recites "an enhancement module selected from a

plurality of enhancement modules, wherein each enhancement module causes a *different*

visual alteration of the loaded content object." Landsman teaches downloading a

configuration file that allows the applet to "readily function in a wide variety of environments." (See column 27, lines 1-12). Conversely, Applicants provide a system wherein the different enhancement modules cause different visual alterations. For instance, a first enhancement module may cause the content object (e.g., ad) to be converted to a game of breakout, while another may cause the content object to be converted to a puzzle. This ability to allow the same content object (e.g., ad) to be subjected to different visual alterations is clearly distinct over the art of record. For these reasons, claims 22 and 28, as well as the claims that depend therefrom are believed allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/8/05

Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile